

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
VALDOSTA DIVISION**

DAWN WOOTEN,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	CASE NO.: 7:22-CV-00148 (WLS)
	:	
LASALLE SOUTHEAST LLC, <i>et al.</i>	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	

---

**Order Denying Motion for Hearing**

On September 18, 2025, Defendants LaSalle Management Company, LLC, LaSalle Southeast, LLC, and David Paulk filed Defendants’ Request for Telephonic Conference Regarding Discovery Dispute (“Motion for Hearing”). (Doc. 113). Defendants assert that Plaintiff “provided insufficient responses and objections” on August 28, 2025, and that Plaintiff later failed to provide revised discovery requests on September 18, 2025. *Id.* On September 18, 2025, Plaintiff filed Plaintiff’s Status Report on Discovery, wherein she states she has engaged with discovery in good faith and “served two comprehensive discovery responses on Defendants” on September 18, 2025, per Defendants’ request. (Doc. 114). Defendants asserted that “if corrected discovery responses were not produced” “they intended to file a Motion to Compel on September 18, 2025.” (Doc. 113 at 2).

Indeed, if Defendants are dissatisfied with Plaintiff’s production, filing a Motion to Compel in accordance with the Court’s 21/21/21 Rule (Doc. 92) is the proper course of action. The Court, as noted in the Discovery Order and as explained in the discovery conference, will only schedule discovery hearings regarding non-compliance with the Discovery Order or the Rules upon the consent of all Parties for the Court’s resolution without formally filed motions.

Hence the Motion for Hearing is **DENIED** without prejudice. (Doc. 113) If Parties consent to a hearing as described, they should schedule it by contacting the Courtroom Deputy consistent with the Discovery Order. (Doc. 92).

**SO ORDERED**, this 22nd day of September 2025.

/s/ W. Louis Sands  
**W. LOUIS SANDS, SR. JUDGE**  
**UNITED STATESDISTRICT COURT**